

REMARKS

The Office Action dated May 8, 2008 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1-41 and 43-44 are currently pending in this application, of which claims 1, 13, 25, 27, 29, 35, 39, 40, 43, and 44 are independent. In particular, Applicants herein amend claims 25, 27, 29, 33, 39, and 40 and cancel claim 42, without prejudice or disclaimer, to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the present application that the Applicants regard as the invention. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments add no new subject matter to the present application and serve only to place the present application in better condition for examination. Entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the rejected pending claims are respectfully requested. It is believed that all grounds for rejection in the Office Action are currently addressed and that the present application is currently in condition for allowance in view of the amendments and the following remarks. Continued allowance of claims 1-24, 35-38, 43 and 44 and reconsideration of claims 25-34 and 39-41 are therefore respectfully requested.

Claim Allowance

Applicants wish to express gratitude for the indication given in the Office Action that claims 1-24, 35-38, 43 and 44 are allowed. Applicants note that these claims are

unchanged in the current Response and therefore respectfully urge that the allowance of these claims be maintained.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C §102(e)

Claims 25-28 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,915,345 (Tummala). However, as described in greater detail below, Tummala neither teaches nor suggests each and every limitation of independent claims 25, 27, and 39, and their dependent claims. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 25-28 and 39 should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 25 relates to an intermediate node for redirecting service requests within a domain of a network, wherein the network comprises a plurality of domains, wherein the intermediate node is connected to an entry node, to a database, and to a plurality of service nodes of the domain. The intermediate node includes a receiving means for receiving a service request from a service request input node, a look-up means for performing, based on a received service request, a look-up in a database for obtaining destination information required for forwarding the service request to a destination, and a sending means for sending the destination information from an intermediate node to the service request input node. The service request input node is configured to forward the service request, based on the received destination information, from the service request input node to the destination, including forwarding the service request to an entry node of the domain for relaying the service request to another domain when the service request is destined for a user terminal not associated with the service nodes of the domain.

Independent claim 27 from which claim 28 depends, relates to a service node of a domain of a network. The network include multiple domains. The service node provides services for a user terminal associated with the service node. These services are requested by service requests originating from the user terminal, and the service node is connected to an entry node of the domain, to an intermediate node of the domain which redirects service requests within the domain, and to service nodes of the domain. The intermediate node is configured to receive a service request from a service request input node, obtain based on a received service request destination information for forwarding the service request to a destination, send the destination information from the intermediate node to the service request input node, and forward the service request based on the received destination information from the service request input node to the destination. This includes forwarding the service request to an entry node of the domain for relaying the service request to another domain when the service request is destined for a user terminal not associated with the service nodes of the domain.

Independent claim 39, from which claim 36 depends, relates to an intermediate node for redirecting service requests within a domain of a network, wherein the network comprises a plurality of domains, wherein the intermediate node is connected to an entry node, to a database, and to a plurality of service nodes of the domain. The intermediate node comprises a receiving unit configured to receive a service request from a service request input node, and a look-up unit configured to perform, based on a received service request, a look-up in a database for obtaining destination information required for forwarding the service request to a destination. The intermediate node further includes a

sending unit configured to send the destination information from the an intermediate node to the service request input node. The service request input node is configured to forward the service request, based on the received destination information, from the service request input node to the destination, including forwarding the service request to an entry node of the domain for relaying the service request to another domain when the service request is destined for a user terminal not associated with the service nodes of the domain.

Applicants have carefully reviewed Tummala and respectfully submit that each of the above-noted independent claims recites subject matter that is not taught or disclosed by Tummala.

Tummala generally discloses an IP-based mobile communications system in which a mobile node changes its point of attachment to the network while maintaining network connectivity. The attachment of the mobile node to the IP mobile communications system is modified by allowing a broker server to maintain client information necessary to establish the a secure Mobile Node connection to the home network..

Tummala neither teaches nor suggest every limitation of claim 25. In particular, Tummala does not disclose the recitations from claims 25 that of “look-up means for performing, based on a received service request, a look-up in a database for obtaining **destination** information required for forwarding said service request to a destination; and sending means for sending **said destination information from an intermediate node to said service request input node.**” Instead, as described above, Tummala discloses that

after the service provider receives a service request, the service provider forwards the request to a node that uses a lookup table 22 to identify requestor source information and returns the source information to a service provider as needed to authenticate the service requester. For example, FIG 3A referenced in the Office Action discloses identifying a requesting user after the request is received by the service provider, identifying the user, and forwarding this identifying information to the service provider. Thus, Tummala does not obtain destination information or use this destination information to send the service request to the appropriate service request input node, as recited in claim 25.

Furthermore, Applicants have carefully reviewed Tummala and respectfully urge that this reference does not teach or suggest the limitation from claim 25 of a service request input node configured to forward the service request, based on the received destination information, from the service request input node to the destination, including forwarding the service request to an entry node of the domain for relaying the service request to another domain when the service request is destined for a user terminal not associated with the service nodes of the domain. Applicants note in particular that Tummala relates to interactions within a domain and is silent regarding services to be provided outside that domain.

For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 25 in view of Tummala is legally and factually improper and should be withdrawn. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 25 are respectfully requested. Likewise, claim 39 that recites similar limitations as claim 25 should be allowed on a similar basis, and claim 26 that depends from claim 39

should be also allowable as depending from allowable claim 39. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 25-26 and 39 are respectfully requested.

The Office Action further alleged that Tummala discloses all recitations of claim 27. For similar reasons as presented above in the discussion of claim 25, Applicants likewise urge that the rejection of claim 27 also should be withdrawn because Tummala does not disclose every recitation of claim 27. For example, claim 27 also recites that “wherein said service node is connected to an entry node of said domain, to an intermediate node of said domain which redirects service requests within said domain, and to service nodes of said domain.” Similarly, Tummala, as described above, fails to disclose the limitation of the intermediate node forwarding the service request to an entry node of the domain for relaying the service request to another domain when the service request is destined for a user terminal not associated with the service nodes of the domain. As described above, the “intermediate node” of Tummala, as specified in the Office Action, identifies the requesting user and does not perform any functions related to redirecting a service request to an appropriate service provider.

For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 27 in view of Tummala is also legally and factually improper and should be withdrawn. Likewise, claim 28 that depends from claim 27 is also allowable as depending from allowable claim 27. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 27-28 are therefore respectfully also requested.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C §103(a)

Claims 29-32, 34, 40, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly obvious in view of Tummala in combination with U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0193110 (Julka). Specifically, the Office Action alleged that Tummala discloses each limitations of these claim except for an intermediate node configured to determine an appropriate destination for the service request, but that this deficiency is cured by Julka. However, as described in greater detail below, the combination of Tummala and Julka neither teaches nor suggests each and every limitation of independent claims 29 and 40, and their dependent claims. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 29-32, 34, 40, and 41 should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 29, from which claims 32 and 33 depend, relates to a service request input node within a domain of a network. The network includes domains, and the service request input node processes service requests originated from user terminals of the network. The service request input node is connected to an intermediate node of the domain which redirects service requests within a domain, and to service nodes of the domain. The service request input node includes a redirecting control means for controlling a redirecting of a received incoming service request, a transmitting means for transmitting the received incoming service request to an intermediate node for obtaining destination information required for forwarding a service request to a destination, and a forwarding means for forwarding the service request, based on the received destination information, from a service request input node to the destination.

The Office Action further alleged that Tummala and Julka disclosed all recitations of claim 29. For similar reasons as presented above in the discussion of claims 25 and 27, Applicants likewise urge that the Tummala does not teach or suggest every limitation rejection of claim 29. As described above, Tummala relates handling connection requests within a domain. In this way, Tummala does not disclose forwarding of the service request to the determined destination, including an entry node to another domain when it is determined that the service request is associated with an address in the other domain, as recited in claim 29.

Applicants further urge that Julka does not cure this deficiency in Tummala because Julka also does not teach or suggest the limitation of determining whether not disclose forwarding of the service request to the determined destination, including an entry node to another domain when it is determined that the service request is associated with an address in the other domain.

Instead, Julka generally relates to a session controller (SC) that provides mobility management support in a wireless communication network. Operating as a logical network entity, the SC of Julka maintains location and session information at an access network controller (ANC) granularity, thus allowing it to track access terminal (AT) transfer between ANCs but within subnet boundaries, where a network subnet comprises one or more ANCs. The SC of Julka also provides updated tag and session information to ANCs and other SCs, as needed. Information exchange with other SCs arises, for example, when two or more SCs cooperate to maintain or transfer routing and session information across subnets.

Accordingly, Applicants note that Julka relates to communications within subnets and does not relate to forwarding a service request to an access controller of another domain, as recited in claims 29.

Applicants further note that the Office Action indicated that claims 33 and 42 were allowable if amended into independent form. Applicants have herein amended claim 40 to include the limitations of claim 42, and cancelled claim 42. Similar limitations originally in claim 33 were also added to claim 29, as described above.

For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 29 in view of Tummala and Julka is factually and legally improper and should be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 32-33, that depend from claim 29, are also allowable as depending from an allowable claim. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 29 and 32-33 are respectfully requested. Likewise, claim 40 that recited limitations similar to claim 29 should also be allowed on a similar basis. Claims 30-31, 34, and 41 that depend from claim 40 should be likewise be allowed as depending from an allowable claim. Consideration and allowance of claims 30-31, 34, and 40-41 are therefore respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that each of claims 1-41 and 43-44 recites features that are neither disclosed nor suggested in any of the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that each of these claims be allowed, and this application be passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by

telephone, the applicants' undersigned representative at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



David D. Nelson
Registration No. 47,818

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-6212
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

DDN/cqc/sew

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time
Check No. 019849 (\$1,110.00)